

To: Robert Law[rlaw@demaximis.com]
Cc: jconnolly@anchorqea.com[jconnolly@anchorqea.com];
pisraelsson@anchorqea.com[pisraelsson@anchorqea.com];
poates@anchorqea.com[poates@anchorqea.com]; wku@anchorqea.com[wku@anchorqea.com]; Yeh,
Alice[Yeh.Alice@epa.gov]; Edward.Garland@hdrinc.com[Edward.Garland@hdrinc.com];
James.Wands@hdrinc.com[James.Wands@hdrinc.com];
RCanizares@moffattnichol.com[RCanizares@moffattnichol.com];
RMathew@moffattnichol.com[RMathew@moffattnichol.com]
From: Naranjo, Eugenia
Sent: Tue 6/4/2013 1:26:55 PM
Subject: RE: Follow-up on Friday's call
[dh_dt-check scale.pdf](#)

Rob,
The attached plots (at the scale requested by Peter), show that we do not have a bug in our model. If you can send us the same plots with the CPG's model today, that will allow us to help you diagnose the problem and have a more informed discussion on Wednesday. Furthermore, I understand that on Friday HQI suggested running the model with a shorter timestep, was that done and did it resolve any of the problems?

Thanks
eugenia

From: Robert Law [rlaw@demaximis.com]
Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 7:20 PM
To: Naranjo, Eugenia
Cc: jconnolly@anchorqea.com; pisraelsson@anchorqea.com; poates@anchorqea.com;
wku@anchorqea.com; Yeh, Alice; Edward.Garland@hdrinc.com; James.Wands@hdrinc.com;
RCanizares@moffattnichol.com; RMathew@moffattnichol.com
Subject: Re: Follow-up on Friday's call

We were going to share it with EPA on Wed. It would be helpful if HQI could provide it at the scale Peter requested.

Thanks

Robert Law, PhD
rlaw@demaximis.com
Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 3, 2013, at 19:09, "Naranjo, Eugenia" <Naranjo.Eugenia@epa.gov> wrote:

> Peter,
> I have not seen the same plot with the version of your model. Can you
send it to us? Thanks,
> eugenia
>
>
>

> From: Peter Israelsson [pisraelsson@anchorqea.com]
> Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 6:18 PM
> To: Wands, James
> Cc: Wen Ku; Rooni Mathew; Rafael Canizares; Naranjo, Eugenia; Yeh,
Alice; Garland, Edward; John Connolly; Peter Oates; Robert Law
> Subject: RE: Follow-up on Friday's call
>
> Thank you, James – this is helpful and I appreciate that you passed

this one on first.

>

> Would it be possible for you to share the underlying data that are plotted here, so that we can more easily compare to the results that we have been seeing? Alternately, could you send the following 2 versions of the plot with zoomed-in axes:

>

> · -60 to 60 cm (for both axes)

>

> · -10 to 10 cm (for both axes)

>

> Regards,

> Peter

>

> Peter H. Israelsson, PhD

> ANCHOR QEA, LLC | www.anchorqea.com<<http://www.anchorqea.com/>>

> Please consider the environment before printing this email.

> This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (617) 547-3830.

>

> From: Wands, James [<mailto:James.Wands@hdrinc.com>]

> Sent: Monday, June 03, 2013 6:00 PM

> To: Peter Israelsson; Garland, Edward

> Cc: Wen Ku; Rooni Mathew; Rafael Canizares; Eugenia Naranjo (Naranjo.Eugenia@epamail.epa.gov); Yeh, Alice (Yeh.Alice@epa.gov)

> Subject: RE: Follow-up on Friday's call

>

> Peter,

>

> Attached is the figure showing the bed elevation change from October 1995 through September 2010 in the EPA RCATOX application compared to the ST-SWEM values. I will try to get the same to you for the ST-SWEM compared to ECOM. Note that we have about 1/3 as many points due to the grid collapse. Let me know if you have any questions.

>

> Thanks,

>

> James

> From: Peter Israelsson [<mailto:pisraelsson@anchorqea.com>]

> Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2013 9:07 AM

> To: Wands, James; Garland, Edward

> Cc: Wen Ku; Rooni Mathew; Rafael Canizares

> Subject: Follow-up on Friday's call

>

> Hi James and Ed –

>

> Thank you for the call on Friday, it was helpful to touch base on this topic before the weekend.

>

> One minor clarification on the crossplots shown on Friday (RCATOX vs OC-linkage net deposition rates for LPR cells; OC-linkage vs ECOM-SEDZLJ

net deposition rates for LPR cells). The time period considered was WY1996 to WY2010 (i.e., 10/1/1995 to 9/30/2010). The plots were mislabeled as WY1995 to WY2010, and I did not realize this while we were on the call. Sorry for any confusion caused.

>

> Would it be possible for you to generate the corresponding plots using your results by tomorrow? We have an internal meeting on Thursday and it would be helpful to have the plots by then, if possible.

>

> Regards,

> Peter

>

>

> Peter H. Israelsson, PhD

>

> ANCHOR QEA, LLC

> 234 Broadway, Suite 2

> Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

> T +1.617.547.3830

> F +1.617.547.3814

> M +1.617.686.4149

> ANCHOR QEA, LLC | www.anchorqea.com<<http://www.anchorqea.com>>

> Please consider the environment before printing this email.

> This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The informant entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (617) 547-3830.

>

>

>